

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to FIG. 2.

The Examiner objected to claims 27-31 as allegedly "being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims". Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner indicated that claims 55-56 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowed subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-25 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7-8, 13-15, 18, 26, 32-33, 38-41, 44 and 46-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Microsoft Corporation, copyright 1999, Microsoft Excel, referred as Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8.

The Examiner rejected claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Microsoft Corporation, copyright 1999, Microsoft Excel, referred as Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8.

The Examiner rejected claims 17, 19, 43 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Excel as applied to claims 1 and 26 above and further in view of Polili, Conferencing Software Available for Windows, InfoWorld, Feb 7, 1994, vol 16, iss 6, pg. 44, 1 pg. Printed from ProQuest as pages 1-2.

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 22-24, 48 and 50-54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Microsoft Corporation, copyright 1999, Microsoft Excel,

referred as Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12 in view of Belzberg (US Pat No. 6,134,535).

The Examiner rejected claims 21 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Excel in view of Belzberg as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Business Editors & High Tech Writers, Belzberg Technologies Inc. Awarded U.S. Patent for Spreadsheet Trading Technology, Business Wire, Oct 20, 2000, page 1, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-2.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-12, 16 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Excel as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, and further in view of Khan *et al.* (US Pat No. 6,157,934).

The Examiner rejected claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Microsoft Corporation, copyright 1999, Microsoft Excel, referred as Excel, screenshots, pages 1-6 in view of Khan *et al.* (US Pat No. 6,157,934).

Applicant respectfully traverses the drawings objections, §101, §102 and §103 rejections with the following arguments.

**Drawings Objections**

The Examiner objected to FIG. 2 alleging there is no description of  $E_1$ ,  $E_2$ , and  $E_3$  in the specification.

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that  $E_1$ ,  $E_2$ , and  $E_3$  are described as a "bordering edge" in the specification on page 5, lines 15-16 which recites: "For example, the drawer  $D_i$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots, N$ ) may be further opened or further closed by dragging a **bordering edge**  $E_i$  of the drawer  $D_i$  instead of by dragging the tab  $T_i$ ." (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to FIG. 2 be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. §101**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-25 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §101 allegedly "because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims fail to meet MPEP 2106's definition of a datastructure: such claimed data structures do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed aspects of the invention which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure's, functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory."

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1-25 and 55 to claim a "computer-readable medium comprising a data display structure encoded therein".

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that claims 1-25 and 55 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §101.

**35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7-8, 13-15, 18, 26, 32-33, 38-41, 44 and 46-47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Microsoft Corporation, copyright 1999, Microsoft Excel, referred as Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8.

Since claims 1 and 26 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 1 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is moot.

Applicants respectfully contend that claims 7-8, 13-15, 18, 32-33, 38-41, 44 and 46-47 are not anticipated by Excel, because Excel does not teach the feature: "wherein each drawer  $D_i$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots, N$ ) includes a tab  $T_i$  adapted to be dragged in a first direction to open drawer  $D_i$  in the first direction and adapted to be dragged in a second direction to close drawer  $D_i$  in the second direction".

Applicants note that allowable claim 27, as well as claim 2 which was not rejected over prior art, comprises the preceding limitation of claims 7-8, 13-15, 18, 32-33, 38-41, 44 and 46-47.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" does not anticipate claims 7-8, 13-15, 18, 32-33, 38-41, 44 and 46-47, and that claims 7-8, 13-15, 18, 32-33, 38-41, 44 and 46-47 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Microsoft Corporation, copyright 1999, Microsoft Excel, referred as Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8.

Applicants respectfully contend that claim 57 is not anticipated by Excel, because Excel

does not teach the feature: "wherein each drawer  $D_i$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots, N$ ) includes a tab  $T_i$  adapted to be dragged in a first direction to open drawer  $D_i$  in the first direction and adapted to be dragged in a second direction to close drawer  $D_i$  in the second direction".

Applicants note that allowable claim 27, as well as claim 2 which was not rejected over prior art, comprises the preceding limitation of claim 57.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" does not anticipate claim 57 and that claim 57 is in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)Claims 17, 19, 43 and 45

The Examiner rejected claims 17, 19, 43 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" and further in view of Polili, Conferencing Software Available for Windows, InfoWorld, Feb 7, 1994, vol 16, iss 6, pg. 44, 1 pg, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-2.

Since claims 17 and 19 depend from claim 2, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicant maintains that claims 17 and 19 are likewise not unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" in view of Polili, Conferencing Software Available for Windows, InfoWorld, Feb 7, 1994, vol 16, iss 6, pg. 44, 1 pg, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Since claims 43 and 45 depend from claim 27, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicant maintains that claims 43 and 45 are likewise not unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" in view of Polili, Conferencing Software Available for Windows, InfoWorld, Feb 7, 1994, vol 16, iss 6, pg. 44, 1 pg, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 20, 22-24, 48 and 50-54

The Examiner rejected claims 20, 22-24, 48 and 50-54 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Microsoft Corporation, copyright 1999, Microsoft Excel, referred as Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12 in view of Belzberg (US Pat No. 6,134,535).

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 20, 48, 53, and 54 are not unpatentable over

"Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12" in view of Belzberg, because "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12" in view of Belzberg does not teach or suggest the feature: "wherein each drawer  $D_i$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots, N$ ) includes a tab  $T_i$  adapted to be dragged in a first direction to open drawer  $D_i$  in the first direction and adapted to be dragged in a second direction to close drawer  $D_i$  in the second direction".

Applicants note that allowable claim 27, as well as claim 2 which was not rejected over prior art, comprises the preceding limitation of claims 20, 22-24, 48 and 50-54.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that claims 20, 22-24, 48 and 50-54 are not unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12" in view of Belzberg and are in condition for allowance.

#### Claims 21 and 49

The Examiner rejected claims 21 and 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Excel in view of Belzberg as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of Business Editors & High Tech Writers, Belzberg Technologies Inc. Awarded US Patent for Spreadsheet Trading Technology, Business Wire, Oct 20, 2000, page 1, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-2.

Since claim 21 depends from claim 20, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12" in view of Belzberg under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicant maintains that claim 21 is likewise not unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12" in view of Business Editors & High Tech Writers, Belzberg Technologies Inc. Awarded US Patent for Spreadsheet Trading Technology, Business Wire, Oct 20, 2000, page 1, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).



Since claim 49 depends from claim 48, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12" in view of Belzberg under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicant maintains that claim 49 is likewise not unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-12" in view of Business Editors & High Tech Writers, Belzberg Technologies Inc. Awarded US Patent for Spreadsheet Trading Technology, Business Wire, Oct 20, 2000, page 1, printed from ProQuest as pages 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Claims 9-12, 16 and 34-37

The Examiner rejected claims 9-12, 16 and 34-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Excel as applied to claims 1 and 26 above, and further in view of Khan et al. (US Pat. No. 6,157,934).

Since claims 9-12 and 16 depend from claim 2, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicant maintains that claims 9-12 and 16 are likewise not unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" in view of Khan under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).


Since claims 34-37 depend from claim 27, which Applicant has argued *supra* to not be unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), Applicant maintains that claims 34-37 are likewise not unpatentable over "Excel, screenshots, pages 1-8" in view of Khan under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 08/16/2005

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts  
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201  
Latham, New York 12110  
(518) 220-1850

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jack P. Friedman  
Registration No. 44,688